DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 737 RC 010 986

AUTHOR Smith, George F.; Klindt, Thomas H.
TITLE The People in Tennessee's Title V Counties: A Summary Report on Characteristics and Attitudes.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Agricultural Experiment Station.
REPORT NO TN-AES-Bull-558
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 60p.; Small print may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Beliefs; Community Attitudes; *Community Development; Community Leaders; Community Surveys; Demography; Housing; *Individual Characteristics; Interviews; *Needs Assessment; Recreational Facilities; *Rural Population; School Systems; *Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS Rural Development Act 1972 Title V; *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Attitudes toward selected rural development activities and basic socioeconomic characteristics of residents of five rural Tennessee counties were examined in 1974 in a study that included interviews with household heads as well as community leaders. Claiborne, Clay, Hancock, Overton, and Pickett counties constituted the pilot area; two surveys were conducted. The first involved personal interviews with some 100 randomly-selected household heads in each county to establish descriptive data (age, sex, education, etc.,) for each member of the household, previous migration of the household, psychic attachment to the area or residence, attitudes toward industrialization and community needs, job-related information, and distribution of household expenditures. In the second part of the study group meetings with community leaders determined their perceptions of local needs priorities; these responses were compared with attitudes expressed by the household heads. Results indicated that the median educational level of adults was less than the state median. Over 60 percent of the interviewees were born in the county of local residence. Attitudes toward increased local industrialization were favorable. Fire protection and improved roads were regarded as high priority community needs; needs related to individual benefits received low priority. Community leaders were shown to reflect local opinions relatively well. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED168737

BULLETIN 558
APRIL 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The People In Tennessee's Title V Counties: A Summary Report On Characteristics and Attitudes

George F. Smith
Thomas H. Klindt

RC 010986

The University of Tennessee
Agricultural Experiment Station
John A. Ewing, Dean
Knoxville

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	3
Introduction	5
Background Information on the Pilot Area	6
Survey Methods	10
Household Characteristics	11
Potential for Mobility Among Pilot Area Residents	13
Attitudes Toward Industrial Development and Community Needs	18
Industrial Development	18
Community Needs	25
Full-Time Employment	28
Nonasset Income	30
Appendices	35

SUMMARY

This publication reports the results of a survey of approximately 100 households and a survey of leaders nominated by the Rural Development Committee in each of five rural Tennessee counties: Claiborne, Clay, Hancock, Overton, and Pickett. These interviews were part of pilot rural development activities under Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972. The purpose of the surveys was to examine certain socioeconomic characteristics in the five-county pilot area and to determine attitudes concerning selected rural development activities.

Among the findings of these surveys were:

1) The age distribution of members of the interviewed households differed from the state-wide age distribution; compared to Tennessee averages, relatively few were in the younger age groups and relatively more were in the older age groups.

2) The median educational levels of adults in the interviewed households were less than the state median.

3) Over 60 percent of the interviewees were born in the county of their current residence, implying a low level of in-migration.

4) A high degree of personal attachment to the counties was found. Eighty percent of the respondents in the household survey stated that they would not permanently leave for any reasonable amount of guaranteed income. Those who expressed a willingness to move tended to be younger and to have more formal education than those who would not move.

5) Relatively larger increases in income would be required to induce relocation to more distant urban centers compared to smaller, nearby cities.

6) Attitudes toward increased local industrialization were generally favorable. Among the potentially negative impacts of industry, respondents in all counties expressed strongest objection to water pollution and least objection to heavy truck traffic on local roads.

7) Residents tended to rank their county as average or above average with regard to community characteristics of potential importance to a firm seeking a new location.

8) The majority of people interviewed stated that they would be either in favor of or indifferent to an enterprise which would attract a significant number of tourists.

9) The majority expressed indifference to an enterprise which would attract labor from other places. Opinion shifted when the possibility was raised that a new business enterprise might encourage past residents to return; the majority of respondents stated that they would favor an enterprise which would attract former residents who had left to work in other areas.

10) Identified community needs were similar in the five counties. In general, needs related to public benefit such as fire protection or improved roads were given high priority, while needs related to individual benefit such as jobs or increased government transfer payments were given low priority.

11) Nominated leaders, when asked to indicate how they thought residents of their respective counties would rank community needs, reflected local opinions relatively well. Statistical tests did not show leaders' impressions of the priorities of residents to be significantly different from actual rankings by a randomly-selected sample of these residents. These results imply that leaders have a fairly accurate feel for the wants of local people and, thus, these leaders can be a useful source of insight when setting community development goals.

12) The average annual income earned by a full-time employee in the five-county area was approximately $6,590. County averages ranged from $7,320 in Claiborne County to $5,740 in Hancock County.

13) Twenty-five percent or more of the full-time employees who resided in each of the pilot counties commuted to another county to work. On the average, commuters earned more than noncommuters; this difference in average annual earnings ranged from about $300 in Pickett County to over $4,000 in Claiborne County.

14) The largest number of full-time workers were employed by firms which were members of the "agriculture, forestry, and fisheries" or "manufacturing" classifications. The greatest percentages of workers were employed as operatives, laborers, and farm workers.

15) Earnings from full-time employment were by far the leading source of nonasset income for the average household in the five counties. Social security payments were the second largest source of nonasset income.

16) The average Pickett County household had the largest annual nonasset income from all sources, $8,482. Apparently, the large number of working spouses in Pickett County was a major influence.

THE PEOPLE IN TENNESSEE'S TITLE V COUNTIES: A SUMMARY REPORT ON CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES

George F. Smith and Thomas H. Klindt*

INTRODUCTION

Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 provided funds for a 3-year pilot rural development program administered by the land-grant colleges and universities. The purpose of Title V was to aid in nonfarm rural development and work toward solution of small farm problems. The vehicle for efforts under this Title was the research, extension, and public service components of higher education institutions in each state.

In Tennessee, a five-county pilot area was selected for study: Clay, Overton, and Pickett counties in the Cumberland Plateau of Middle Tennessee and Claiborne and Hancock counties in East Tennessee (see Figure 1).

The aim of the Title V task force was to work on problems and needs which had a high priority among the local residents. Therefore, it was first necessary to gain insights into the attitudes and beliefs of pilot area residents. However, in addition, it was also necessary to determine levels of various socioeconomic characteristics of area residents because these characteristics affect the feasible rural development options.

To meet these informational needs, one of the first steps in this program was to conduct two surveys in the pilot area. In one, randomly-selected heads of households were interviewed. The purpose was to obtain current information on various aspects of the level of living, income, employment, attitudes, and community needs. In the second, persons nominated as local leaders by the five-county rural development committees were interviewed. A primary objective was to determine their attitudes toward community needs for comparison with attitudes held by the randomly-selected household heads.

*Assistant Professor, Extension Resource Development, and Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Figure 1. The Study Area

The purpose of this report is to present a summary of basic survey data. Since the intention of this report is to sketch some of the basic socioeconomic characteristics and attitudes in the five counties, much of the information was compiled and presented without comment. However, it is believed that the information will be of use to local leaders in designing their rural development programs. In addition, the information should be of use to research and Extension personnel in establishing their programs for the pilot area and also serve as a benchmark with which to gauge subsequent developmental activities. Moreover, to the extent that the attitudes toward industrialization and community needs by the residents and leaders reflect the attitudes of rural residents in general, the information may be helpful in setting priorities for rural development activities.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PILOT AREA

The five counties which comprise the pilot area are basically "rural" under nearly any definition of the term. The 1970 populations ranged from 3,774 in Pickett County to 19,420 in Claiborne County, see Table 1. In the decade prior to 1970, two of the counties, Claiborne and Overton, exhibited modest increases in population while Clay, Hancock, and Pickett counties had population decreases of 9.1, 13.4, and 14.8 percent, respectively. Only Overton County had a portion of its population defined as urban by the census; all residents of the other four counties were defined as rural. The percent of population defined as rural nonfarm ranged from 34.6 percent in

Table 1. Population changes and characteristics in the pilot area[a]

	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
1970 population [a]	19,420	6,624	6,719	14,666	3,774
1960 population[a]	19,067	7,289	7,757	14,661	4,431
Percent population[a] change 1960-1970	+1.9	-9.1	-13.4	+1.4	-14.8
Percent urban 1970[a]	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5[c]	0.0
Percent rural nonfarm – 1970[b]	62.4	58.7	34.6	57.7	52.9
Percent farm – 1970[b]	37.6	41.3	65.4	21.8	47.1
Median Age – 1970[a]	29.0	31.5	29.7	30.6	32.2

[a]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, **U. S. Census of Population, 1960,** Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population, Chapter A, Table 6, and **1970,** General Population Characteristics, Tennessee, PC(1)-B44, Table 16, 20 and 35 as reported in Center for Business and Economic Research, **Tennessee Statistical Abstract, 1974,** College of Business Administration, The University of Tennessee, Table 16.6.

[b]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, **City and County Data Book, 1972,** Table 2.

[c]Livingston, a town in Overton County, had a population of about 3,000 which was just over the number needed for an "urban" classification.

Hancock County to 62.4 percent in Claiborne County. Moreover, the percent of population defined as rural farm ranged from 21.8 percent in Overton County to 65.4 percent in Hancock County. The median age in each of the pilot counties was slightly higher than for the state as a whole (28.1 years).

According to the 1970 Census, the median family income in the pilot area for 1969 was lowest, $2,683, in Hancock County and highest, $4,612, in Pickett County, see Table 2. These median family incomes were all considerably lower than the comparable figure for the state of $7,447.[1] The percent of families with incomes below the poverty level in 1969 as defined by the federal government ranged from 33.9 percent in Pickett County to 55.5 percent in Hancock County. The comparable figure for the state was 18.2 percent.[2]

During 1970, unemployment levels in the pilot area were higher than the state average. Unemployment rates in the five counties were

[1]Center for Business and Economic Research, **Tennessee Statistical Abstract, 1974,** College of Business Administration, the University of Tennessee, Table 11.5.

[2]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. **U. S. Census of Population, 1970,** General and Social Economic Characteristics, PC(1)-C44, Tennessee, Table 58. As an example, the threshhold of poverty in 1969 was $3,743 for a nonfarm family of four and $3,195 for a farm family of four.

Table 2. Income levels in the pilot area, 1969[a]

	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
Median family income	$4,266	$3,701	$2,683	$4,348	$4,812
Percent of families below poverty level[b]	38.7	39.3	55.5	35.9	33.9

[a]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population. 1970, General Social and Economic Characteristics, PC(1)-C44, Tennessee, Tables 58 and 124 as reported in Center for Business and Economic Research, Tennessee Statistical Abstract, 1974, College of Business Administration, The University of Tennessee, Tables 11.6 and 11.16.

[b]As adopted by a federal interagency committee in 1969. For a more complete description see the above noted Tennessee Statistical Abstract, Table 11.16.

7.1 percent in Claiborne, 7.1 percent in Clay, 6.3 percent in Hancock, 5.6 percent in Overton, and 6.0 percent in Pickett.[3] These compare to a 1970 state-wide average of 4.4 percent.

The percent of total employment by industrial classification for 1970 in each county is presented in Table 3. It may be seen that the manufacturing industry was the greatest single employer in each county. However, considerable variation existed among counties. In Overton and Pickett counties. 44.3 and 43.2 percent of total employment was in manufacturing, while the comparable figure for Claiborne County was 25.1 percent. Other census categories which accounted for substantial portions of the work force included agriculture, forestry and fishing, construction, wholesale and retail trade, and services.

The topography and natural resources are similar throughout the counties in the pilot area. Generally, they may be described as having a rough terrain comprised of forested ridges with small valleys interspersed throughout the area. The pilot counties vary in land area from 174 square miles in Pickett County to 455 in Claiborne County, Table 4.

All of the counties have within their boundaries, or are near, large water impoundments. Two of the counties, Clay and Pickett, have approximately 10 percent of their total area covered by inland water, primarily Dale Hollow Lake, a Corps of Engineers reservoir. This lake also reaches into Overton County. Claiborne County adjoins and has within its boundaries a portion of Norris Lake, a large TVA reservoir. The headwaters of this lake flow through Hancock County. In addition to lakes, each county has within its boundaries several miles of relatively undisturbed mountain rivers.

[3]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, City and County Data Book, Table 2.

Table [illegible]al number of employees 16 years old and over and the percent [illegible]ior industry groups in the pilot area, 1970[a]

	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
Total employed	5,467	2,196	1,574	5,117	1,215
Percent in agriculture forestry and fisheries	12.2	17.3	22.1	8.4	10.4
Percent in mining	4.4	1.0	1.7	0.5	1.3
Percent in construction	7.3	11.5	8.4	8.5	10.0
Percent in manufacturing	25.1	33.6	29.5	44.3	43.2
Percent in transportation, communication and public utilities	4.6	3.0	1.4	2.5	2.9
Percent in wholesale and retail trade	16.3	9.0	11.0	12.6	12.7
Percent in finance, insurance and real estate	2.3	1.2	0.4	1.8	0.4
Percent in services	24.7	20.5	22.2	19.5	15.5
Percent in public administration	3.2	3.0	3.2	1.9	3.6

[a]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, **U. S. Census of Population, 1970,** General Social and Economic Characteristics, PC(1)-C44 Tennessee, Table 123. Percents calculated as reported in Center for Business and Economic Research, **Tennessee Statistical Abstract, 1974,** College of Business Administration, The University of Tennessee, Table 12.5.

Table 4. Land use in the pilot area[a]

	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
Total area (square miles)	455	264	230	422	174
Percent inland water area	2.5	11.9	0.0	0.3	9.1
Percent land area	97.5	88.1	100.0	99.7	90.9
Percent of total area in commercial forests, 1971	57.1	58.6	58.0	61.6	60.1

[a]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, **Area Measurement Reports,** GE-20, No. 44, 1964 and Southern Forest Experiment Station, 1971, Arnold Hedlund and J. M. Earles, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, **Forest Statistics for Tennessee Counties,** Table 3 as reported in Center for Business and Economic Research, **Tennessee Statistical Abstract, 1974,** College of Business Administration, The University of Tennessee, Table 9.1 and 8.11.

Land use in each county is dominated by privately-owned forests. The percent of total area in each county in this use ranged from 57 percent in Claiborne County to 62 percent in Overton County. It should be noted, however, that little intensive forest utilization exists in any of the counties.

SURVEY METHODS

The data presented in the remainder of this report are from two surveys conducted in the pilot area: a survey of randomly-selected households and a survey of nominated leaders. These surveys were conducted by the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, the University of Tennessee, in cooperation with personnel from the state and local offices of the Agricultural Extension Service.

An effort was made to interview approximately 100 households in each of the five pilot counties.[4] Information requested in the interview included descriptive data (age, sex, education, etc.) for each member of the household, previous migration of the household, psychic attachment of the household head to the area of residence, attitudes toward industrialization, attitudes concerning priority community needs, job-related information for full-time employees, sources of earned and transfer income, and the local and nonlocal distribution of household expenditures.

In total, 485 usable interviews were taken from August through December of 1974—95 in Claiborne County, 95 in Clay County, 101 in Hancock County, 102 in Overton County, and 92 in Pickett County. The number of households interviewed represent 1.9, 5.2, 5.7, 2.5, and 9.0 percent, respectively, of the total number of families in the counties in 1970. Efforts were made to interview the head of the household whenever possible and in 80 percent of all surveys, the head of the household was the respondent.

In addition to the household survey, a leader's survey was conducted in each county. Each local rural development committee compiled a list of leaders who represented many of the special interest groups and localities in the county. Sometime in the August to November, 1974, period the leaders were invited to a meeting and were interviewed as a group. The leader's survey was much less detailed than the household survey and concentrated primarily upon attitudes and perceptions concerning the priority of needs in the local area. In all, 148 leaders were interviewed—17 in Claiborne County, 39 in Clay County, 31 in Hancock County, 32 in Overton County, and 29 in Pickett County.

[4]See Appendix A for the methods used in randomly selecting households.

11

Certain questions were included in both surveys so that comparisons could be made. These comparisons are presented later in this report.

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Part of the reason for conducting the benchmark survey was to delineate certain characteristics of the households in the pilot area. Such information may be useful in providing a backdrop for other findings in the surveys and in addition may itself provide guidance in establishing priorities for rural development efforts.

Selected characteristics of surveyed household members in the five pilot counties are shown in Tables 5 through 9. In Table 5, the average numbers of persons in the surveyed households are presented together with the distributions of family sizes. The largest average family size, 3.5 persons, was found in Claiborne County whereas Clay County had the smallest average family size, 2.9 persons. The figures showing the distribution of family size indicate that few households had more than six members and that most households had between two and four persons.

Table 5. Family size distribution in pilot area surveyed households, 1974

Number of persons in the household	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
	Percent				
One	6.3	22.1	6.9	14.7	5.4
Two	31.6	26.3	38.6	28.4	45.7
Three	16.8	16.8	22.8	16.7	20.7
Four	24.2	17.9	13.9	17.6	9.8
Five	7.4	9.5	8.9	11.8	12.0
Six	6.3	5.3	5.0	2.9	5.4
Seven	5.3	0.0	3.0	6.9	0.0
Eight	1.1	2.1	0.0	1.0	1.1
Nine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ten	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Eleven	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average number of persons in surveyed households	3.48	2.93	3.13	3.26	2.99

The age distributions of household members are shown in Table 6. Age distribution was relatively consistent among the five counties. The most noticeable deviation was in Overton County which had a slightly higher percentage in the younger age groups. However, relative to the 1970 state average, the pilot area in general had fewer young people and more who were 55 years of age or older.

Table 6. Age distribution in pilot area surveyed households, 1974

Age	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett	State average 1970[a]
	Percent					
0 thru 4	5.1	5.8	7.3	8.3	4.5	8.3
5 thru 9	8.5	8.3	7.3	11.3	6.8	9.6
10 thru 14	14.2	11.6	7.0	10.7	9.4	10.1
15 thru 19	10.8	6.5	11.9	9.5	11.6	9.6
20 thru 24	4.1	7.2	8.6	5.5	8.6	8.2
25 thru 34	11.7	9.8	15.9	15.0	11.6	12.5
35 thru 44	12.0	11.9	9.3	10.1	12.4	11.4
45 thru 54	10.1	12.6	7.6	8.6	14.3	11.2
55 thru 64	13.6	13.7	11.6	10.1	11.6	9.4
65 thru 74	6.0	10.1	7.6	7.6	7.5	6.2
75 and over	3.8	2.5	6.0	3.4	1.5	3.6

[a]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, General Population Characteristics PC(1)-B44, Tennessee, Table 20.

The educational levels of persons over 18 years of age is presented in Table 7. The distribution of educational levels indicated little difference among the counties. In every county, more than one-half of the persons over 18 years of age had 8 or fewer years of formal education. Further, the percentage of these adults with less than 12 years of education ranged from 66 percent in Hancock County to 78 percent in Claiborne County. The median years of school completed by persons over 18 years of age ranged between 5 and 8. In contrast, the median years of school completed by persons 25 years of age and older in the state in 1970 was 10.6.[5] This rough

[5]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population, 1970, General Social and Economic Characteristics, PC(1)-C, Tennessee, Table 46.

Table 7. Educational attainment of persons over 18 years of age in pilot area surveyed households, 1974

Years completed	Claiborne (n=139)	Clay (n=192)	Hancock (n=206)	Overton (n=201)	Pickett (n=187)
0	6.0	6.2	4.8	6.0	1.6
1 thru 4	15.1	9.4	10.7	11.0	7.0
5 thru 8	41.7	43.2	35.4	42.3	44.9
9 thru 11	15.1	13.0	14.6	14.4	12.8
12	18.0	20.8	26.7	18.9	24.6
13 thru 16	4.0	6.2	7.3	7.0	8.6
17 and over	0.0	1.0	.5	.5	.5

comparison indicates that the educational attainment within the pilot counties was considerably less than the state as a whole.

As an indication of mobility into the counties, the birthplace of the survey respondent was determined. The results are presented in Table 8. Over 60 percent of the survey respondents in each county were born in their resident county. In Hancock County, some 83 percent of the survey respondents were natives. While no comparable figures for counties elsewhere in Tennessee are available to constitute a "norm," these figures would appear to indicate relatively little migration into the pilot areas.

Table 8. Birthplace of pilot area survey respondents, 1974

Birthplace	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
	Percent				
In home county	63.2	69.5	83.2	62.7	63.0
Elsewhere in Tennessee	16.9	12.7	7.9	26.5	25.0
Not in Tennessee	20.0	17.9	8.9	10.8	12.0

To provide a measure of their level of living, respondents were asked whether the household possessed any of the 21 items listed in Table 9. The responses in all five counties indicate that the household item most commonly possessed was an electric or gas range. Figures in Table 9 which may be used to reflect the quality of housing in the pilot area show that piped-in water was found in 96 percent of Claiborne County households and only 74 percent of Clay County households. The percentage of households with hot water heaters ranged from 70 to 85 in Clay and Pickett counties, respectively, while the percent with inside flush toilets ranged from 67 in Clay County to 82 in Pickett County. The presence of a telephone in surveyed households ranged from a low of 54 percent in Clay County to 72 in Claiborne County.

The items possessed by relatively few households included central home air-conditioning, electric dishwashers, and boats and motors.

POTENTIAL FOR MOBILITY AMONG PILOT AREA RESIDENTS

Because there has historically been a net migration from rural areas, efforts were made to estimate the attachment that pilot area residents had for their current location or, alternatively, their potential for mobility. This examination consisted of comparing selected characteristics of those respondents who would, with monetary inducement, move from their resident county with those who would

Table 9. Percent of surveyed households in the pilot area which possess selected home furnishings and consumer items

Household items	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
	Percent				
1. Electric (or gas) range	97.9	96.8	96.0	97.1	97.8
2. Piped-in water	95.8	73.7	87.1	83.3	87.0
3. Kitchen sink	89.5	75.8	93.1	84.3	86.0
4. Hot water heater	84.2	70.5	83.2	77.5	84.8
5. Inside flush toilet	78.9	67.4	77.2	75.5	81.5
6. Bath or shower	77.9	66.3	73.3	75.5	79.3
7. Television—black and white	57.9	65.3	79.2	66.7	71.7
8. Home freezer	68.4	72.6	60.4	62.7	68.5
9. Telephone	71.6	53.7	67.3	63.7	65.2
10. Vacuum cleaner	63.2	60.0	57.4	58.8	75.0
11. Automatic washing machine	51.6	47.4	51.5	56.9	56.5
12. Clothes dryer	50.5	38.9	34.7	38.2	51.1
13. Stereo player	42.1	28.4	30.7	35.3	41.3
14. Television—color	36.8	28.4	21.8	36.3	26.1
15. Wall-to-wall carpet	26.3	26.3	18.8	29.4	41.3
16. Air conditioner in car	33.7	31.6	15.8	31.4	28.3
17. Air conditioner in home	22.1	30.5	15.8	29.4	19.6
18. Two or more bathrooms	16.8	12.6	5.0	13.7	15.2
19. Boat and motor	8.4	10.5	2.0	12.7	16.3
20. Electric dishwasher	10.5	6.3	5.9	8.8	5.4
21. Central air conditioner	5.3	1.1	1.0	4.9	2.2

not. Further, the addition to annual family income required to induce relocation to four selected centers outside the pilot counties was calculated.

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the amount of annual family income they would have to receive to move to 1) Cookeville, Tennessee (for Clay, Overton and Pickett county respondents), or Morristown, Tennessee (for Claiborne and Hancock county respondents); 2) Knoxville, Tennessee; 3) Cincinnati-Indianapolis or other major northern city; and 4) Atlanta or other major southern city. Cookeville and Morristown are both non-SMSA cities of moderate size, one of which is within 40 miles of the survey locations. Knoxville is within an SMSA which had a 1970 population of 409,409 and is within 100 miles of any of the pilot counties.

Of the total number of respondents, 99 (20 percent) indicated that they would move to at least one of the locations. The remainder indicated that they would not move to any of the locations or gave such high monetary requirements that it was judged they were in effect indicating they would not move. The number of households which would move to each of the four locations is shown in Table

10. The number of respondents who would move to Cookeville (Morristown) or Knoxville was 81 and 80, respectively. However, only 46 respondents would move to Cincinnati, and 49 to Atlanta. This reflects the aversion which many rural residents have for living in large urban areas. It should be noted that the respondents were largely heads of established households who had remained in the pilot counties; they probably represent a select group which is more reluctant to move than their many peers who had, in fact, moved away (and were therefore not included in the survey). Further, those surveyed did not include high school students who might well be more mobile. However, even given these qualifications, the responses indicate a low degree of mobility among households in the pilot county.

To further examine potential mobility, comparisons were made of selected characteristics of respondents who would and would not move to the four locations (Table 10). In general, the most mobile household was one which had a head who was relatively young, well educated, and had relatively high nonasset income. The average nonasset income (earned income plus transfer payments) of those who would move to at least one of the locations was $8,189, which is considerably higher than the comparable figure of $5,643 for those who would not move. Those who would move tended to be younger and better educated (36 years of age 9.3 years of education) than those who would not move (51 years of age with 7.7 years of education). In addition, a less than proportionate number of farmers and persons holding managerial, administrative, or professional positions indicated a willingness to move.

To provide a comparative assessment of potential mobility among the four locations, the additional income which would be required to induce moving to each location was calculated. The amounts which the respondents indicated they would have to receive to move to the various locations was compared to respondents' current incomes to determine the additional income which would be necessary to induce them to move. From Table 10, it may be seen that the average annual income required for those who would move to each of the four locations increased from Cookeville or Morristown ($10,951) to Knoxville ($12,009) to Atlanta ($14,003) to Cincinnati ($15,726).

By subtracting the average annual nonasset income from the annual income required to move, the *addition* to current income which would be required to induce relocation to the four locations was determined. This increase in household income was $3,019 for Cookeville (Morristown) and only slightly higher, $3,111 for Knoxville. However, to change locations to Atlanta would require a $5,525

Table 10. Selected characteristics of pilot area survey respondents who would and would not leave their resident county for monetary inducement, 1974

	All households	Households which would move to at least one location	Households which would move to Cookeville (Morristown)[a]	Households which would move to Knoxville	Households which would move to Cincinnati	Households which would move to Atlanta	Households which would not move to any of the locations
Number	485	99	81	80	46	49	386
Average nonasset income	$6,163	$8,189	$7,932	$8,898	$7,796	$8,478	$5,643
Average age	48.2	36.2	37.3	36.7	31.3	33.4	51.3
Average education	8.0	9.3	9.0	9.7	9.8	9.8	7.7
Percent holding managerial, administrative or professional positions	12.0	14.1	13.6	17.5	13.0	20.4	11.4
Percent farmers	10.9	7.1	7.4	6.3	6.5	8.2	11.7
Average annual income required to induce households to move			$10,951	$12,009	$15,726	$14,003	
Additional family income required to induce households to move			$3,019	$3,111	$7,930	$5,525	

[a]Survey respondents in Clay, Overton, and Pickett counties were asked if they would move to Cookville while respondents in Claiborne and Hancock counties were asked if they would move to Morristown. The difference stems from the fact that the two groups of counties are in separate geographic locations and the desire to elicit responses concerning relocation to a small growth center in a nearby location.

increase in income while the comparable figure for Cincinnati was $7,930. These figures indicate that relatively large monetary inducements would be required for the surveyed rural residents to move to centers away from their home county. Further, they suggest that relatively higher inducements would be required for relocations to large urban areas, particularly large northern cities.[6]

The percent of respondents in each county who would relocate and the distribution of monetary inducements required for each of the relocation sites is shown in Appendix Table 1. It was found that Hancock County had the smallest percentage of households which expressed a willingness to relocate while Overton County had the highest percentage. For example, 5 percent of the respondents in Hancock County would relocate to Cincinnati and 11 percent would move to Morristown, while on the other hand, 17 percent of the Overton County respondents would move to Cincinnati and 24 percent would relocate in Cookeville.

Moreover, there were sizable differences from county to county in the average amounts required by respondents to induce them to move to specific locations. For example, those who indicated they would relocate from Hancock County to Knoxville would do so for an average annual income of $10,292, whereas the comparable figure for Clay County respondents was $13,188. However, it should be noted that the number of observations on which these figures are based was quite small. In general, no county had consistently higher or lower monetary requirements for relocation to all of the four sites. Therefore, there is little reason to believe that the residents of a particular county are more strongly attached to their county than the residents of any other county. The only evidence of differentiation among the counties was that in Hancock County a small but consistently higher percentage of the respondents indicated that they would not move to any of the possible relocation sites.

In summary, a great majority of the respondents indicated little or no inclination for leaving their resident county. Those who would consider leaving tended to be younger and better educated than the respondents who expressed no desire to leave their resident county. Also, groups which might be considered more "established" in the community because of property ownership or position—farmers, managers, administrators, and members of professions—exhibited greater reluctance to leave than other groups.

[6]Some part of these increases in income may represent the respondents' estimates of the difference in costs of comparable levels of living between the pilot area and the four alternative locations. Respondents were not questioned on their beliefs regarding cost-of-living differentials among locations.

Respondents who were willing to leave would require less monetary inducement to move to a relatively small, nearby city than to larger, more distant urban areas. However, the average additional income required to move to any of the locations (in excess of $3,000) was high relative to average nonasset income ($8,189 for households which would move to at least one location). This implies that, although a willingness to relocate exists for approximately 20 percent of the households, many have reservation incomes which are in excess of what could reasonably be expected. Therefore, it is unlikely that they would, in fact, relocate.

ATTITUDES TOWARD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY NEEDS

One of the basic aims of Tennessee's Title V program was to aid the pilot counties in addressing the community needs on which the local residents placed a high priority. To gain insights into these priorities, a portion of the benchmark survey was directed toward determining the attitudes of the pilot area residents toward industrial development in their respective counties. Further, questions were asked to establish priorities among a broad spectrum of possible community needs. It was believed that such information would aid local civic leaders and agency representatives concerned with development efforts, as well as officials at state and federal levels who formulate development strategies and programs.

Industrial Development

Persons interviewed in the household survey were asked three sets of questions relating to their attitudes toward industry, and one set of questions concerning their attitudes toward people moving into the county. The responses are presented in Tables 11 through 14.

In the first set of questions, respondents were asked about their reactions to nine statements related to the impact of industrialization on their community, such as "The creation of industrial jobs will change our lives too much." They were asked to indicate which of seven categories ranging from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly" best reflected their attitude. These questions were asked to learn about the overall reaction of the public toward industrialization of their communities. If a negative reaction was found, development alternatives other than increased industrialization might need to be pursued. The statements and the percentage distribution of responses for each county are presented in Table 11.

A great majority of the people interviewed in each county responded to each of the nine statements in a manner which could be interpreted as being favorable toward industrialization. The results were quite consistent in that there was little discernible difference

Table 11. Attitudes of surveyed pilot area residents concerning the impact that industrialization would have on their county, 1974

Attitudes	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
			Percent		
1. The creation of industrial jobs will change our lives too much					
Disagree strongly	47.1	62.0	14.0	47.4	72.6
Disagree	40.0	25.0	68.0	38.1	21.4
Disagree mildly	1.4	2.2	2.0	9.3	1.2
No opinion	1.4	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Agree mildly	2.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.2
Agree	1.4	4.3	10.0	1.0	2.4
Agree strongly	5.7	5.4	0.0	3.1	1.2
2. The creation of industrial jobs would solve many of this community's greatest problems					
Agree strongly	55.9	62.5	33.0	67.7	74.7
Agree	32.4	23.9	53.0	24.0	18.4
Agree mildly	2.9	4.5	4.0	3.1	1.1
No opinion	1.5	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree mildly	1.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1
Disagree	2.9	4.5	3.0	3.1	2.3
Disagree strongly	2.9	3.4	1.0	2.1	2.3
3. Bringing more industry into this community will be an influence for better living					
Agree strongly	60.6	80.6	32.0	75.5	90.7
Agree	33.8	14.0	61.0	19.4	9.3
Agree mildly	2.8	0.0	4.0	4.1	0.0
No opinion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree mildly	1.4	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree	0.0	2.2	2.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree strongly	1.4	2.2	1.0	1.0	0.0
4. The creation of industrial jobs in this community makes good sense					
Agree strongly	66.2	81.5	27.6	77.2	85.9
Agree	29.6	13.0	67.3	16.8	11.8
Agree mildly	0.0	0.0	3.1	3.0	1.2
No opinion	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree mildly	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree	2.8	3.3	0.0	1.0	0.0
Disagree strongly	1.4	2.2	1.0	2.0	1.2
5. Bring new industry to this community will cause too much friction					
Disagree strongly	50.0	60.9	11.2	64.6	69.4
Disagree	41.4	26.4	69.4	30.2	18.8
Disagree mildly	0.0	2.3	5.1	0.0	0.0

Table 11. Continued

Attitudes	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
	Percent				
No opinion	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0
Agree mildly	2.9	4.6	0.0	0.0	2.4
Agree	1.4	2.3	6.1	2.1	3.5
Agree strongly	4.3	3.4	0.0	3.1	5.9
6. Industrialization will not meet the needs of this community					
Disagree strongly	48.6	67.1	12.9	50.5	59.5
Disagree	41.4	22.4	57.0	31.6	24.1
Disagree mildly	1.4	1.2	5.4	3.2	1.3
No opinion	0.0	0.0	10.8	1.1	0.0
Agree mildly	2.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.3
Agree	4.3	4.7	12.9	5.3	1.3
Agree strongly	1.4	4.7	0.0	8.4	12.7
7. I personally would like to see a lot more of industry come to this county					
Agree strongly	67.6	85.6	33.3	84.0	85.9
Agree	28.2	8.9	63.6	13.0	8.2
Agree mildly	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.4
No opinion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree mildly	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Disagree	2.8	2.2	1.0	2.0	0.0
Disagree strongly	1.4	3.3	0.0	0.0	2.4
8. Jobs for our people are a lot more important than smoke-free air					
Agree strongly	38.6	64.8	13.3	55.1	59.7
Agree	22.9	13.2	53.3	23.5	10.4
Agree mildly	14.3	7.7	8.9	2.0	5.2
No opinion	0.0	0.0	5.6	1.0	0.0
Disagree mildly	5.7	1.1	3.3	1.0	9.1
Disagree	11.4	5.5	14.4	10.2	3.9
Disagree strongly	7.1	7.7	1.1	7.1	11.7
9. No company would want to build a new factory in this county					
Disagree strongly	38.8	67.4	8.2	66.3	61.3
Disagree	52.2	23.3	54.1	27.2	25.3
Disagree mildly	4.5	3.5	3.5	1.1	1.3
No opinion	0.0	0.0	20.0	1.1	0.0
Agree mildly	3.0	1.2	0.0	1.1	1.3
Agree	1.5	1.2	14.1	1.1	2.7
Agree strongly	0.0	3.5	0.0	2.2	8.0

among the counties or among the various aspects of industrial impact on the local community.

Even though a generally favorable reaction to industrialization may exist, it was believed that local residents might object to certain external effects produced by industrial firms. If selected negative externalities were thought to be serious by the people in the counties, then civic leaders could take the information into consideration when dealing with prospective firms which might locate in the area. Those surveyed were thus requested to consider some of the potentially negative impacts of industrialization such as pollution, increased traffic, school crowding, and higher taxes. They were asked if they would have "no objection," "mild objection," or "strong objection" to a firm which caused the given condition.

The six impacts considered and the responses given in each county are shown in Table 12. The greatest percentage of strong

Table 12. Attitudes of pilot area residents concerning potentially negative impacts of industrialization, 1974

Attitudes	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
			Percent		
1. Polluting the air (with smoke)					
No objection	33.0	35.5	35.4	30.9	21.1
Mild objection	30.9	26.9	33.3	39.4	46.7
Strong objection	36.2	37.6	31.3	29.8	32.2
2. Putting out a bad odor					
No objection	12.8	21.3	11.9	13.5	6.7
Mild objection	21.3	28.7	34.7	29.2	13.3
Strong objection	66.0	50.0	53.5	57.3	80.0
3. Polluting the rivers and streams (with sewage or waste material)					
No objection	9.6	13.8	10.0	12.5	2.2
Mild objection	3.2	7.4	20.0	13.5	10.9
Strong objection	87.2	78.7	70.0	74.0	87.0
4. Heavy truck traffic on the roads					
No objection	63.8	71.0	64.0	71.9	70.8
Mild objection	17.0	20.4	22.0	21.9	23.6
Strong objection	19.1	8.6	14.0	6.3	5.6
5. Overcrowded schools					
No objection	33.0	49.5	31.3	37.6	22.9
Mild objection	33.0	23.1	31.3	32.3	41.0
Strong objection	34.0	27.5	37.4	30.1	36.1
6. Increased the amount of taxes you have to pay					
No objection	32.6	31.5	28.3	28.4	28.1
Mild objection	22.8	20.7	22.2	18.9	28.1
Strong objection	44.6	47.8	49.5	52.6	43.8

objections in each county was to a plant which would pollute the rivers and streams with sewage or waste material. Other impacts for which there was a high percent of strong objections included putting out a bad odor and increasing taxes. Impacts for which there were nearly as many "no objections" as "strong objections" included overcrowding schools and polluting the air with smoke. Of the six impacts listed, heavy truck traffic on local roads was regarded as least objectionable; approximately two-thirds of the respondents stated that they would have no objection to this impact.

In a third group of questions, the people interviewed were asked to rate the existing situation in their county with respect to 10 community characteristics (such as housing, recreational facilities, and the school system) which might be important to a business considering a location in the county. Certainly, the evaluations of a community by its own residents may not be completely objective or accurate. However, these beliefs can materially affect the ability of local leaders to alter community characteristics in efforts to attract firms into the area. For example, if the residents believed that local industrial sites were altogether adequate when in fact they were not, passing bond issues to improve industrial sites might be difficult. Knowledge of the perceptions which people have of their own community may, then, indicate a need for educating them on certain topics as well as identifying potential development needs. The respondents' evaluations of their communities are presented in Table 13.

In general, those interviewed rated their county as being average or better for each characteristic. Once again, there was little discernible difference in response among counties. Those characteristics which were generally rated highest included a labor force willing to work, a labor force that is easy to train, available industrial sites, and high school graduates looking for work in the respective counties. Other characteristics which were ranked as average or slightly above average included housing for company officials, recreational facilities, the school system, medical facilities, the road system, and the availability of cheap power.

A fourth set of questions probed the attitudes of the respondents toward business which brought a number of people into their county as tourists or employees. The people interviewed were asked to respond in one of five categories ranging from "like a lot" to "dislike a lot." The statements and responses from each county are presented in Table 14.

When asked about a business which would bring a large number of tourists into the county, most responses were in the "like a lot" or "not care" category. This relatively low level of aversion to

Table 13. Ratings given pilot area counties concerning community characteristics of potential interest to industry, by surveyed residents, 1974

Ratings	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
	Percent				
1. Housing for the company officials and their families					
Very good	2.1	5.7	0.0	6.3	1.2
Good	21.1	30.7	47.9	28.1	18.6
Average	41.1	38.6	32.3	27.1	32.5
Bad	24.2	21.6	15.6	35.4	33.7
Very bad	11.6	3.4	4.2	3.1	14.0
2. Recreational facilities for the company officials and their families					
Very good	3.3	10.1	1.0	11.5	8.2
Good	20.9	25.8	29.2	39.6	29.4
Average	33.0	36.0	34.4	29.2	24.7
Bad	28.6	21.3	29.2	14.6	29.4
Very bad	14.3	6.7	6.3	5.2	8.2
3. The school system					
Very good	7.4	16.7	3.1	5.1	9.2
Good	57.4	44.4	51.0	48.0	58.6
Average	24.5	25.6	32.3	30.6	32.3
Bad	9.6	11.1	10.4	12.2	0.0
Very bad	1.1	2.2	3.1	4.1	0.0
4. Medical facilities					
Very good	7.4	6.7	3.0	5.2	5.7
Good	47.9	45.5	46.5	34.4	23.0
Average	27.7	33.3	28.3	38.5	32.2
Bad	16.0	10.0	20.2	19.8	27.6
Very bad	1.1	4.4	2.0	2.1	11.5
5. A labor force willing to work					
Very good	12.5	8.9	17.0	13.5	14.1
Good	50.0	53.3	64.0	51.0	55.3
Average	29.5	31.1	14.0	27.1	23.5
Bad	6.8	5.6	4.0	5.2	7.1
Very bad	1.1	1.1	1.0	3.1	0.0
6. A labor force that is easy to train					
Very good	11.1	10.0	11.1	11.7	12.9
Good	60.0	62.2	76.8	52.1	58.8
Average	24.4	25.6	11.1	33.0	27.1
Bad	4.4	2.2	1.0	3.2	1.2
Very bad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 13. Continued

Ratings	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
	Percent				
7. Industrial sites					
Very good	12.5	11.6	9.2	11.7	8.4
Good	58.0	58.1	54.0	63.8	62.7
Average	26.1	24.6	31.0	21.3	25.3
Bad	3.4	4.7	5.7	3.2	3.6
Very bad	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. The road system					
Very good	1.1	4.3	4.0	5.0	3.3
Good	26.3	43.6	42.4	32.0	28.9
Average	36.8	35.1	21.2	30.0	46.7
Bad	21.1	16.0	25.3	27.0	16.7
Very bad	14.7	1.1	7.1	6.0	4.4
9. High school graduates looking for work in this area					
Very good	18.2	12.2	17.0	15.2	15.6
Good	51.1	42.7	61.7	41.3	48.1
Average	26.1	36.6	9.6	33.7	24.7
Bad	3.4	6.1	8.5	7.6	11.7
Very bad	1.1	2.4	3.2	2.2	0.0
10. Availability of cheap power (such as electricity, coal, gas)					
Very good	5.6	5.7	4.3	9.8	8.6
Good	38.9	55.2	41.3	40.2	30.9
Average	37.8	32.2	44.6	34.8	53.1
Bad	17.8	6.9	8.7	13.0	7.4
Very bad	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.2	0.0

tourists is not in keeping with the sterotyped image of the rural person and his attitudes. As a result of the adjacent lakes and related recreation opportunities, a noticeable though perhaps modest tourist flow exists in the pilot area. It may be hypothesized that the residents of the pilot area have had some experience with the benefits which tourism can bring and have altered some of their preconceptions.[7]

When respondents were asked about a business which would bring people into the county to work, the responses indicated that it would depend partly upon whether those moving into the county were previous residents. On the average, respondents appeared to be indifferent about people coming in from other states to work, but were in favor of attracting former residents, see Table 14.

[7] An alternative explanation is, of course, that this stereotype is itself a misconception.

Table 14. Attitudes of surveyed pilot area residents concerning the influx of people into their county, 1974

Attitudes	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
			Percent		
1. How would you feel about a business that brought a lot of tourists to this county?					
Like lot	34.2	48.9	15.2	41.7	46.7
Like little	13.7	7.6	25.3	11.5	13.3
Not care	38.4	37.0	45.5	37.5	32.2
Dislike little	6.8	2.2	8.1	2.1	6.7
Dislike lot	6.8	4.3	6.1	6.3	1.1
2. How would you feel about a business that brought a lot of people from outside the state to this county to work?					
Like lot	18.5	20.9	10.3	23.7	25.9
Like little	23.9	23.1	24.7	15.5	24.7
Not care	16.3	22.0	30.9	33.0	27.1
Dislike little	12.0	18.7	17.5	10.3	11.8
Dislike lot	29.3	15.4	16.5	17.5	10.6
3. How would you feel about a business that brought back a lot of people that used to live in this county but left to work somewhere else?					
Like lot	72.8	75.3	68.0	79.2	81.1
Like little	15.2	14.0	16.5	8.3	10.1
Not care	6.5	8.6	10.3	12.5	8.9
Dislike little	2.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
Dislike lot	3.3	2.2	3.1	0.0	0.0

Briefly, the attitudes of pilot area respondents toward industrialization may be summarized as follows. They were, in general, quite favorable toward industrialization of their communities and felt that their communities possessed better than average characteristics to induce industrial firms into their area. Although desiring industrialization, they objected to industrial impacts which would degrade the natural environment but were not as concerned with overburdening public facilities. They appeared to be indifferent to people coming into their area because of industrialization but were pleased by the possibility of former residents returning to the area.

Community Needs

To shed light on priority goals for Title V rural development efforts, respondents in both surveys were asked to rank 29 possible community needs in their own county. (See Appendix Tables 2 through 6 for the list of the needs included in the survey.) The

respondents were given a list of these possible needs and instructed to 1) select the items most needed in their county, 2) select the single most important item and give it a score of 100, and 3) rate the other items selected by indicating their importance as a percentage of the item selected as most important. An example may help: assume that a person feels items 1, 5, and 10 are important needs in his county and that item 5 is the most important need. He would give item 5 a score of 100 (100 percent). If item 1 is felt to be half as important as item 5, item 1 would be given a score of 50 (50 percent). If item 10 is felt to be only 10 percent as important as item 5, item 10 would be given a score of 10 (10 percent).

During tabulation, all responses were standardized to give each respondent 100 points, distributed according to the weights he provided. This was done to avoid giving respondents who used large numbers more weight than respondents who used small numbers.

People interviewed in the household survey were asked to respond as they *personally believed*, while leaders were asked to go through the ranking process twice: first as they *personally believed* and second as they *thought the county residents would react* to this list of possible needs. (These responses were also standardized and are presented in columns two and three of Appendix Tables 2 through 6.)[8]

Finally, the leaders were asked to evaluate the situation in their county in relation to other rural counties for each of the 29 possible community needs; for example, how did the roads in their county compare with roads in other counties? The leaders were instructed to score their county on a zero to 10 scale—10 if they personally believed the county situation was so superior that no improvement would be possible and zero if they believed the reverse were true. (The average score given each item is presented in column four of Appendix Tables 2 through 6.)

It was found that items of a public service character tended to be ranked as high priority needs while items of a more personal benefit character tended to be given a lower priority. The people who were interviewed were, in general, established heads of households whose "private" needs (an education, a job, etc.) have been met to some degree. "Public" needs (fire protection, roads, etc.) might then be expected to be relatively more important.

[8]The leaders in Overton County were asked only to indicate whether they thought an item was a concern to county residents, not to rank the needs. Column 3 of Appendix Table 5 is, then, a count of these responses rather than an average standardized score.

In comparing the responses within a county, it would be expected that an item which ranked high as a priority need would receive a low "situation" score when compared to other counties. Likewise, it would be expected that an item which was given a relatively low priority would receive a fairly high "situation" score when compared to other counties. This inverse relationship between the ranking reported in the first three columns of Appendix Tables 2 through 6 and the situation score reported in the fourth column of these tables, in general, appeared to exist.

In comparing the responses among counties, it appeared that people interviewed in the household survey agreed fairly closely on the ranking of these community needs. It also appeared that, while there were differences on specific items, the county leaders did fairly well when asked to rank the needs as they believed the county residents would rank them. The *overall array* of the 29 rankings appeared quite similar for leaders and household groups.

To determine whether more than appearances were involved, various statistical methods were employed to test for significant differences between 1) the arrays of rankings by the household respondents among the five counties, 2) the arrays of rankings by leaders as they personally believed versus household responses in each county, and 3) the arrays of rankings by leaders as they believed the county residents would feel versus household responses in each county. In no case was a significant difference found.[9] That is, the hypothesis that the average ranking of needs in the five counties by randomly-selected household heads and leaders were made by people from the same population could not be disproven.

Identifying the felt needs of client groups is a persistent concern in rural development programs. Even in an area as small as a county, various factions no doubt exist which have community improvement priorities which differ from the norm. However, the above results show that—when the priority needs were aggregated

[9]The statistical tests included chi square and correlation analysis of the arrays of felt needs shown in Appendix Tables 2 through 6 and factor analysis which utilized the individual observations. The differences, according to each of the tests, were far from being significantly different. It was recognized that many of the 29 identified needs had a low priority among all groups. Because the inclusion of low priority needs (which might be almost randomly distributed) could obscure significant differences in the higher ranked items, those needs which had a numerical score of less than average (3.4) by all groups were excluded and statistical tests recalculated. Once again, no significant differences were found. To further test for differences, individual felt needs were compared between the various combinations of leaders and household respondents using a "t" test. Significant differences (at the 0.05 level) were found in only a few instances.

in each of the five pilot counties—the leaders reflected the overall needs relatively well. This implied that the leaders in the pilot areas were in tune with the people they represent and their views were fair proxies for the felt needs of the people. Programs developed in concert with the local leadership should, therefore, address what the residents would identify as major problems.

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Because employment is an important component of rural development, a substantial portion of the benchmark survey was devoted to determining characteristics of full-time employment of household members in the pilot area.

The number of full-time employees represented in the survey population is shown in Table 15.[10] To place the number of full-time employees on a comparable basis among counties, the average number of full-time employees per household was calculated. These figures ranged from a low of 0.79 per household in Hancock County to a high of 1.12 per household in Pickett County. The percentages of full-time employees in each county who were household heads, spouses, or other household members are also presented in Table 15. The figures show that in Pickett County, where more full-time employees per household existed, relatively more spouses were employed. Alternatively, in Hancock County, where the average number of full-time employees per household was lowest, relatively fewer spouses were full-time employees.

[10]The designation of full-time employment was left to the discretion of the respondent as opposed to setting hour limits.

Table 15. Number of full-time employees in pilot county surveyed households, 1974

Category	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
Total number of full-time employees in surveyed households	84	82	80	87	103
Average number of full-time employees per household	.88	.86	.79	.85	1.12
The percent of full-time employees which were:					
Head of household	66.7	59.3	72.5	60.8	54.5
Spouse	16.7	29.6	18.8	25.3	38.6
Other household member	16.7	11.1	8.8	13.9	7.0
The percent of full-time employees which commuted out of resident county to work	33.8	32.9	30.1	37.2	24.2

In the pilot counties, it was found that many of the full-time employees commuted out of their resident county to work. The percent who commuted from each county to work is also presented in Table 15. It can be seen that the greatest proportion of workers who commuted was found in Overton County (37 percent), whereas the lowest commuting rate was found in Pickett County (24 percent). The job location of all full-time employees surveyed is shown in Appendix Table 7. It was found that most workers who commuted worked in counties closely surrounding the resident county. However, some workers were reported to commute as far as Alabama.

The average annual income of all full-time employees from their jobs is shown in Table 16 together with the distribution among household members and distribution by commuting status. As expected, household heads were consistently paid more than other household members. For example, in Overton County there was an average difference of $3,599 and $3,881 between the household head and the spouse and the other household members, respectively. The difference was somewhat less in Hancock County where the average household head received $1,910 and $416 more than a spouse or other household member, respectively. In comparing earnings from full-time employment, those who commuted to work from their resident county earned substantially more than those who did not commute (Table 16). The average difference ranged from $4,029 in Claiborne County to $308 in Pickett County.

The percent of employees which worked for firms in the various industrial classifications in the five counties is presented in Appendix Table 8. In addition, the distribution among industrial classifications is shown by household members and by those who commute to work. For example, it was found that of all full-time employees in Claiborne County, 16 percent worked in firms in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries classification and that 1.2 percent of all full-time employees commuted out of the county to work in firms in this

Table 16. Average annual income of full-time employees in pilot county surveyed households, 1974

Category	Claiborne	Clay	Hancock	Overton	Pickett
			Dollars		
All full-time employees in survey	7,320	6,378	5,741	6,873	6,645
Heads of households	8,386	7,208	6,143	8,245	7,208
Spouse	5,648	5,085	4,233	4,646	6,310
Other household members	4,565	6,081	5,727	4,364	4,394
Employed in resident county	5,681	6,129	4,992	6,713	6,569
Employed out of resident county	9,710	6,747	7,200	7,142	6,877

industrial classification. Further, it was found that of all household heads, 20 percent worked in this industrial classification and 1.8 percent commuted out of the county. No spouses worked in firms classified as agriculture, forestry, and fisheries. Of all other fully employed household members, 15 percent worked in this industrial classification and none commuted out of the county.

It was found that more full-time employees worked in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries or manufacturing than in any other single classification. The composition of workers in these two classifications may be examined by referring to the distribution of employment among household members. In the five counties, the percent of heads of households employed in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries ranged from 15 to 45 percent. Moreover, the percent of full-time employed spouses working in the manufacturing classification ranged from 43 to 68 percent. For classifications other than agriculture and manufacturing, there was a rather general distribution of employment in total, by household members, and by commuting status.

The type of employment of full-time employees in the five counties is shown in Appendix Table 9. As expected in these rural counties, the categories with the largest percent of full-time employees were operatives, laborers, and farm workers. These findings were consistent with the data concerning industrial classification of employees (Appendix Table 8) which showed the largest percentage of employees in agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and manufacturing.

NONASSET INCOME

Income is a widely accepted measure of level of living; both the amount and the source are indicators of personal well-being. In addition, it represents a major potential resource for development activities. The amounts of income received from various sources by surveyed households for each of the five pilot counties are presented in Table 17. The first column under each county heading shows the percent of households which received income from the source listed at the left of the table. The second column indicates the average dollar amount received by those households in the county which received income from that source. The third column represents the dollar amount received averaged over all surveyed households in the county.

By far, the largest source of nonasset income was full-time employment.[11] The average for all surveyed households in each

[11]In certain cases, survey respondents indicated that they did have full-time employment but would not reveal the income received from that source. To compute the averages shown in Table 17, these cases were credited with the county's average earnings for full-time employees.

Table 17. Sources and amounts of nonasset income in pilot county surveyed households, 1974

Income source	Claiborne County			Clay County		
	Percent of households which receive income	Average annual value to recipient households	Average over all households	Percent of households which receive income	Average annual value to recipient households	Average over all households
Full time employment	69.5	9,316	6,472	61.1	9,017	5,505
Part time jobs	18.9	1,091	206	14.7	3,006	442
Odd jobs	4.2	340	14	2.1	960	20
Sale of crafts	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0
Aid to dependent children	5.3	1,598	85	2.1	774	16
Veterans payments	6.3	2,262	143	8.4	2,515	211
Unemployment benefits	10.5	953	100	9.5	2,313	220
Welfare	4.2	1,855	78	7.6	1,807	137
Old age assistance	4.2	1,340	56	3.2	1,124	36
Social Security	31.6	2,008	635	30.2	1,852	565
Other Government payments	2.1	1,455	31	5.3	2,698	143
Food stamps (net value)	26.3	551	145	16.8	865	145
Other Sources	3.2	1,556	50	5.3	2,220	118
Total nonasset income			8,015			7,558

Table 17. Continued

Income source	Hancock County			Overton County		
	Percent of households which receive income	Average annual value to recipient households	Average over all households	Percent of households which receive income	Average annual value to recipient households	Average over all households
Full time employment	60.4	7,529	4,547	62.7	9,343	5,862
Part time jobs	11.9	2,117	252	13.7	2,275	312
Odd jobs	1.0	75	1	4.9	2,728	134
Sale of crafts	1.0	250	2	1.0	3,120	31
Aid to dependent children	3.0	1,316	39	3.9	1,185	46
Veterans payments	9.9	1,634	162	14.7	1,693	249
Unemployment benefits	3.0	3,604	108	8.8	2,105	185
Welfare	9.9	1,211	120	5.9	1,442	85
Old age assistance	3.0	1,072	32	0.0	0	0
Social Security	37.6	1,497	563	35.3	1,822	643
Other Government payments	3.0	1,520	46	4.9	2,043	100
Food stamps (net value)	15.8	1,021	163	17.6	823	145
Other sources	3.0	2,520	76	7.8	2,407	188
Total nonasset income			6,111			7,980

Table 17. Continued

Income source	Pickett County		
	Percent of households which receive income	Average annual value to recipient households	Average over all households
Full time employment	69.6	10,694	7,440
Part time jobs	10.9	1,036	113
Odd jobs	1.1	200	2
Sale of crafts	3.3	117	4
Aid to dependent children	0.0	0	0
Veterans payments	12.0	1,649	198
Unemployment benefits	3.3	893	29
Welfare	3.3	497	16
Old age assistance	1.1	1,800	20
Social Security	23.9	1,755	419
Other Government payments	2.2	2,532	56
Food stamps (net value)	14.1	938	132
Other sources	4.3	1,230	53
Total nonasset income			8,482

county ranged from $4,547 in Hancock County to $7,440 in Pickett County. These figures reflect the differences in the average number of full-time employees per household reported in Table 15 which showed Hancock County to be the lowest with 0.79 and Pickett County to be the highest with 1.12. The percent of households which had at least one full-time employee was highest in Pickett and Claiborne counties with about 70 percent each. The lowest, 60 percent, was found in Hancock County.

A large component of household incomes in the counties was social security payments. These were the second largest and the second most frequent source of nonasset income. In Pickett County, 24 percent of the surveyed households received income from social security. However, more than 30 percent of the respondents in the other counties received social security benefits, with the highest being 38 percent in Hancock County. Social security benefits were also the second largest source of nonasset income when averaged over all households in the sample. The average household income from this source ranged from $419 in Pickett County to $643 in Overton County.

Total nonasset income (the sum of all sources listed in Table 17) averaged from $6,111 in Hancock County to $8,482 in Pickett County. The difference in nonasset income among counties existed

primarily because of differences in earnings from full-time employees; other sources of earned income and transfer payments to households were quite similar. As noted previously, Hancock County had the smallest number of full-time employees per household and, in addition, full-time employees in Hancock County had the lowest average income of the five counties. As a result, average household income from full-time employment in Hancock County was nearly $1,000 less than the average income in Clay, the county with the next lowest earnings from full-time employment.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

The objective of the sampling technique in each county was to select households at random after having stratified by city-rural and by census divisions in rural areas. The number of households to be interviewed was arbitrarily set at 100 per county. Within each county, the number of households surveyed in each city and census division was proportionate to the 1970 county population.

Each of the noncity census division strata was divided into area segments of approximately 20 occupied nonseasonal dwellings. This was accomplished by using county road maps which indicated dwelling locations. Area segments were numbered and the particular segments to be sampled were selected by use of a table of random numbers. Every fourth occupied nonseasonal dwelling, starting from a predetermined arbitrary point, was selected for interview. This process was used until the appropriate number of surveys from each census division was obtained.

The sampling method used within cities was similar when detailed maps showing occupied dwellings were available. However, in the smaller towns where detailed maps were unavailable, maps showing occupied dwellings were constructed by the interview team and the same selection method as outlined above was used.

Appendix Table 1. Monetary inducements required to induce pilot area survey respondents to relocate, 1974

Category	Claiborne		Clay		Hancock		Overton		Pickett	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Would not move to Cookeville (Morristown)[a]	84	88.4	80	84.2	90	89.1	78	76.5	72	78.3
Would move to Cookeville (Morristown)	11	11.6	15	15.8	11	10.9	24	23.5	20	21.7
Distribution of amounts required for people to move to Cookeville (Morristown)										
Less than $9,999	6	6.3	6	6.4	4	4.0	12	11.8	8	8.7
$10,000 to $19,999	3	3.2	8	8.5	5	5.0	10	9.8	11	11.9
$20,000 and over	2	2.1	1	1.1	2	2.0	2	2.0	1	1.1
Average amount required for people to move		$11,802		$11,393		$11,304		$10,110		$10,970
Would not move to Knoxville	80	84.2	80	84.2	93	92.1	76	74.5	76	82.6
Would move to Knoxville	15	15.8	15	15.8	8	7.9	26	25.5	16	17.4
Distribution of amounts required for people to move to Knoxville										
Less than $9,999	6	6.3	6	6.3	3	3.0	9	8.8	4	4.3
$10,000 to $19,999	6	6.3	7	7.4	4	4.0	14	13.7	11	11.9
$20,000 and over	3	3.2	2	2.1	1	1.0	3	2.9	1	1.1
Average amount required for people to move		$12,231		$13,188		$10,292		$11,560		$12,288
Would not move to Cincinnati	89	93.7	89	93.7	96	95.0	85	83.3	80	87.0
Would move to Cincinnati	6	6.3	6	6.3	5	5.0	17	16.7	12	13.0
Distribution of amounts required for people to move to Cincinnati										
Less than $9,999	2	2.1	3	3.2	2	2.0	2	2.0	2	2.2
$10,000 to $19,999	2	2.1	1	1.1	2	2.0	11	10.8	7	7.6
$20,000 and over	2	2.1	2	2.1	1	1.0	4	3.9	3	3.3
Average amount required for people to move		$18,217		$12,580		$11,180		$18,424		$14,125

Appendix Table 1. Continued

Category	Claiborne		Clay		Hancock		Overton		Pickett	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Would not move to Atlanta	90	94.7	87	91.6	95	94.1	87	85.3	77	83.7
Would move to Atlanta	5	5.3	8	8.4	6	5.9	15	14.7	15	16.3
Distribution of amounts required for people to move to Atlanta										
Less than $9,999	1	1.1	3	3.2	2	2.0	2	2.0	2	2.2
$10,000 to $19,999	2	2.1	3	3.2	2	2.0	11	10.7	10	10.8
$20,000 and over	2	2.1	2	2.1	2	2.0	2	2.0	3	3.3
Average amount required for people to move	$15,580		$12,155		$12,650		$14,247		$14,760	

[a]Survey respondents in Clay, Overton, and Pickett counties were asked if they would move to Cookeville while respondents in Claiborne and Hancock counties were asked if they would move to Morristown. The difference stems from the fact that the two groups of counties are in separate geographic locations and the desire to elicit responses concerning relocation to a small growth center in a nearby location.

Appendix Table 2. The importance of 29 possible community needs as evaluated by residents of Claiborne County, 1974

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
1. Improve the condition of the roads	9.8	9.8 (2)[b]	10.2 (2)[b]	2.3
2. Maintain more stable prices of what I buy and what I sell at a level where I can make a living	9.0	10.2 (1)	11.0 (1)	2.2
3. Have more medical services available	8.4	6.9 (5)	6.2 (5)	5.0
4. Have the schools provide better job training for the children	5.6	7.3 (4)	7.7 (4)	4.5
5. Get more public services for my tax dollar	5.4	4.2 (8)	3.4 (12)	4.2
6. Ambulance service quickly available	5.2	2.0 (19)	3.8 (11)	5.2
7. Assess property taxes more fairly	4.9	3.3 (13)	2.4 (16)	5.6
8. Improve on the fairness of how laws are made and enforced	4.8	3.6 (11)	4.1 (10)	3.9
9. Increase or improve the recreational facilities	4.4	4.5 (7)	5.9 (6)	2.6
10. Be able to get steady work	4.3	5.1 (6)	1.2 (21)	3.8
11. Additional markets to sell my farm products	3.6	8.6 (3)	9.2 (3)	2.1
12. Strengthen the laws about protection of the environment	3.4	.7 (26)	2.3 (17)	3.4
13. Make the local leadership be more responsive to the voters	3.2	3.2 (15)	2.9 (14)	4.2
14. Get more money from my job	3.1	3.3 (14)	1.7 (19)	3.5
15. Have adequate countywide fire protection	3.1	1.8 (20)	4.2 (9)	1.4
16. Have training so I can get a better job	2.6	3.7 (10)	.4 (27)	3.7
17. Find a better way to get rid of garbage and sewage	2.5	3.4 (12)	4.2 (8)	5.4
18. Improve and extend the telephone system	2.5	2.4 (17)	2.5 (15)	5.2
19. Have good safe water at my house	2.4	4.0 (9)	3.3 (13)	3.9
20. Make bus service available throughout the county	2.2	1.1 (23)	1.3 (20)	2.6
21. Increase or improve the physical facilities of the schools	2.1	2.5 (16)	5.5 (7)	5.2

Appendix Table 2. Continued

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
22. Be located closer to my job	1.5	1.8 (21)[b]	.4 (28)[b]	4.7
23. Conserve the use of energy resources	1.5	.8 (25)	2.0 (18)	3.8
24. Improve the size or condition of my house	1.0	1.2 (22)	.5 (26)	4.6
25. Get on the welfare roll promptly without so much paper work	.9	.6 (27)	.6 (25)	6.1
26. Know that public financial assistance is readily available	.7	2.1 (18)	.8 (24)	4.7
27. Have more training programs from the County Agent's office	.6	1.1 (24)	1.1 (22)	5.6
28. Improve TV reception	.5	.6 (28)	.9 (23)	5.8
29. Increase welfare payments so I can take care of my family	.5	.2 (29)	0.0 (29)	6.3

[a]The larger the number the more importance the group attaches to the item. The mean score is 3.4.

[b]Rank in parenthesis.

[c]The mean score is 5.0. A score of 5.0 for an item indicates that the leaders feel that the situation in the county is comparable to the situation in other counties with which they are familiar. A score greater than (less than) 5.0 indicates that the group feels that the situation in the county is better than (worse than) the situation in other counties. The range is zero to ten.

Appendix Table 3. The importance of 29 possible community needs as evaluated by residents of Clay County, 1974

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
1. Have more medical services available	8.7	2.7 (15)[b]	1.6 (19)[b]	5.4
2. Have the schools provide better job training for the children	8.4	5.0 (7)	11.4 (1)	2.9
3. Maintain more stable prices of what I buy and what I sell at a level where I can make a living	7.5	9.2 (2)	10.6 (2)	2.7
4. Have adequate countywide fire protection	6.3	1.7 (21)	4.8 (10)	2.2
5. Improve the condition of the roads	5.3	11.0 (1)	9.6 (3)	3.2
6. Find a better way to get rid of garbage and sewage	4.5	3.5 (15)	5.6 (6)	4.0
7. Get more public service for my tax dollar	4.5	4.7 (9)	5.6 (7)	3.6
8. Assess property taxes more fairly	3.7	2.7 (16)	2.9 (13)	4.5
9. Make bus service available throughout county	3.7	1.0 (24)	1.7 (16)	2.4
10. Get more money from my job	3.7	8.2 (3)	1.5 (21)	3.0
11. Have training so I can get a better job	3.4	5.9 (4)	1.7 (17)	2.4
12. Have good safe water at my house	3.4	4.1 (11)	5.0 (8)	4.3
13. Increase or improve the recreational facilities	3.3	4.8 (8)	7.2 (4)	3.5
14. Know that public financial assistance is readily available	3.2	5.3 (6)	3.3 (12)	4.4
15. Improve and extend the telephone system	3.1	3.6 (12)	6.4 (5)	3.4
16. Strengthen the laws about protection of the environment	3.1	.6 (27)	1.7 (18)	4.3
17. Ambulance service quickly available	2.8	.8 (25)	1.6 (20)	6.6
18. Improve on the fairness of how laws are made and enforced	2.7	1.1 (23)	.9 (23)	4.7

Appendix Table 3. Continued

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
19. Make the local leadership be more responsive to the voters	2.6	1.8 (20)[b]	2.1 (14)[b]	5.0
20. Additional markets to sell my farm products	2.6	5.4 (5)	4.9 (9)	2.0
21. Be able to get steady work	2.6	4.7 (10)	2.1 (15)	3.2
22. Improve the size or condition of my house	2.3	1.2 (22)	1.1 (22)	4.6
23. Increase or improve the physical facilities of the schools	2.2	2.3 (17)	4.6 (11)	4.0
24. Conserve the use of energy resources	1.6	.9 (29)	.7 (25)	4.5
25. Be located closer to my job	1.4	3.1 (14)	.8 (24)	4.7
26. Have more training programs from the County Agent's Office	1.1	.7 (26)	.6 (26)	4.4
27. Improve TV reception	.9	.5 (28)	.2 (27)	5.3
28. Get on the welfare roll promptly without so much paper work	.7	2.1 (18)	0.0 (28)	5.4
29. Increase welfare payments so I can take care of my family	.6	2.1 (19)	0.0 (29)	5.8

[a]The larger the number the more importance the group attaches to the item The mean score is 3.4.

[b]Rank in parenthesis.

[c]The mean score is 5.0. A score of 5.0 indicates that the leaders feel that the situation in the county is comparable to the situation in other counties with which they are familiar. A score greater than (less than) 5.0 indicates that this group feels that the situation in the county is better than (worse than) the situation in other counties. The range is zero to ten.

Appendix Table 4. The importance of 29 possible community needs as evaluated by residents of Hancock County, 1974

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
1. Have more medical services available	9.0	4.1 (9)[b]	6.8 (4)[b]	4.4
2. Improve the condition of the roads	8.8	9.5 (2)	14.5 (2)	2.2
3. Maintain more stable prices of what I buy and what I sell at a level where I can make a living	7.4	9.0 (3)	5.6 (5)	2.4
4. Be able to get steady work	6.5	3.9 (10)	4.0 (10)	2.9
5. Have the schools provide better job training for the children	6.1	7.9 (4)	4.6 (7)	1.9
6. Additional markets to sell my farm products	5.2	2.8 (14)	5.4 (6)	1.7
7. Be located closer to my job	4.7	1.1 (25)	.3 (25)	3.4
8. Make the local leadership be more responsive to the voters	4.4	1.8 (18)	7.9 (3)	4.1
9. Assess property taxes more fairly	4.1	4.7 (8)	2.3 (15)	4.1
10. Get more public service for my tax dollar	4.1	2.8 (12)	1.9 (19)	3.4
11. Get more money from my job	4.1	1.3 (24)	2.1 (18)	4.0
12. Increase or improve the physical facilities of the schools	3.4	2.8 (13)	2.2 (17)	3.6
13. Improve the fairness of how laws are made and enforced	3.4	.3 (29)	3.1 (11)	4.4
14. Have adequate countywide fire protection	3.1	4.9 (7)	4.1 (8)	1.8
15. Have ambulance service quickly available	3.1	2.4 (16)	1.7 (21)	5.4
16. Increase or improve the recreational facilities	3.1	1.4 (22)	2.7 (12)	2.4
17. Have good safe water at my house	2.9	5.2 (6)	2.4 (14)	5.7
18. Have training so I can get a better job	2.2	3.2 (11)	1.1 (22)	2.0

Appendix Table 4. Continued

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
19. Increase welfare payments so I can take care of my family	2.2	.9 (26)[b]	0.0 (27)[b]	6.0
20. Improve and extend the telephone system	2.0	7.4 (5)	2.4 (13)	4.2
21. Find a better way to get rid of garbage and sewage	1.9	10.6 (1)	14.7 (1)	1.2
22. Improve the size or condition of my house	1.7	1.6 (19)	.9 (23)	4.3
23. Strengthen the laws about protection of the environment	1.4	2.6 (15)	4.0 (9)	2.0
24. Conserve the use of energy resources	1.2	1.5 (20)	1.8 (20)	3.8
25. Know that public financial assistance is readily available	1.2	1.4 (23)	.7 (24)	5.4
26. Have more training programs from the County Agent's office	.9	.3 (28)	0.0 (28)	3.8
27. Make bus service available throughout the county	.8	.8 (27)	.3 (26)	1.1
28. Get on the welfare role promptly without so much paper work	.8	1.4 (21)	0.0 (29)	4.8
29. Improve TV reception	.1	2.3 (17)	2.3 (16)	4.1

[a]The larger the number the more importance the group attaches to the item. The mean score is 3.4.

[b]Rank in parenthesis.

[c]The mean score is 5.0. A score of 5.0 for an item indicates that the leaders feel that the situation in the county is comparable to the situation in other counties with which they are familiar. A score greater than (less than) 5.0 indicates that this group feels that the situation in the county is better than (worse than) the situation in other counties. The range is zero to ten.

Appendix Table 5. The importance of 29 possible community needs as evaluated by residents of Overton County, 1974

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Number of leaders indicating belief that item is important to other county residents	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
1. Have more medical services available	8.6	22	8.9 (2)[b]	4.5
2. Maintain more stable prices of what I buy and what I sell at a level where I can make a living	6.8	26	5.5 (8)	2.4
3. Have adequate countywide fire protection	6.6	8	2.9 (14)	1.3
4. Improve the condition of the roads	6.4	31	10.4 (1)	2.6
5. Have the schools provide better job training for the children	5.8	20	6.3 (4)	2.9
6. Ambulance service quickly available	5.7	10	2.3 (18)	6.0
7. Get more public services for my tax dollar	4.7	17	6.0 (6)	3.8
8. Increase or improve the physical facilities of the schools	4.5	16	8.0 (3)	2.9
9. Improve and extend the telephone system	4.3	19	4.1 (11)	4.2
10. Get more money from my job	4.3	21	3.9 (13)	3.5
11. Improve on the fairness of how laws are made and enforced	3.8	9	2.3 (19)	5.7
12. Assess property taxes more fairly	3.6	21	5.7 (7)	5.0
13. Additional markets to sell my farm products	3.6	19	2.6 (16)	3.0
14. Have good safe water at my house	3.1	10	4.1 (12)	5.1
15. Make bus service available throughout county	3.0	2	0.0 (25)	2.4
16. Strengthen the laws about protection of the environment	2.7	7	2.2 (20)	3.5
17. Find a better way to get rid of garbage and sewage	2.7	10	4.5 (9)	5.0

Appendix Table 5. Continued

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Number of leaders indicating belief that item is important to other county residents	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
18. Make the local leadership be more responsive to the voters	2.4	15	6.2 (5)[b]	4.0
19. Know that public financial assistance is readily available	2.3	4	2.1 (21)	5.8
20. Increase or improve the recreational facilities	2.3	11	4.2 (10)	4.0
21. Be able to get steady work	2.2	19	2.5 (17)	4.9
22. Have training so I can get a better job	1.9	8	0.0 (26)	4.9
23. Be located closer to my job	1.7	4	.3 (24)	5.7
24. Improve the size or condition of my house	1.5	6	1.3 (22)	4.8
25. Increase welfare payments so I can take care of my family	1.5	5	0.0 (27)	6.2
26. Conserve the use of energy resources	1.4	2	2.9 (15)	3.9
27. Improve TV reception	1.0	6	0.0 (28)	4.6
28. Get on the welfare roll promptly without so much paper work	1.0	2	0.0 (29)	4.8
29. Have more training programs from the County Agent's office	.5	1	.8 (23)	6.0

[a]The larger the number the more importance the group attaches to the item. The mean score is 3.4.

[b]Rank in parenthesis.

[c]The mean score is 5.0. A score of 5.0 for an item indicates that the leaders feel that the situation in the county is comparable to the situation in other counties with which they are familiar. A score greater than (less than) 5.0 indicates that this group feels that the situation in the county is better than (worse than) the situation in other counties. The range is zero to ten.

Appendix Table 6. The importance of 29 possible community needs as evaluated by residents of Pickett County, 1974

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
1. Have more medical services available	11.5	11.5 (2)[b]	9.4 (2)[b]	2.3
2. Maintain more stable prices of what I buy and what I sell at a level where I can make a living	7.3	12.7 (1)	12.1 (1)	2.1
3. Improve the condition of the roads	6.7	6.7 (3)	7.8 (3)	4.0
4. Have the schools provide better job training for the children	6.2	5.2 (7)	6.2 (7)	3.7
5. Ambulance service quickly available	6.0	5.4 (6)	6.4 (6)	5.7
6. Have adequate countywide fire protection	5.7	4.8 (9)	7.5 (4)	1.8
7. Additional markets to sell my farm products	5.4	6.2 (4)	5.9 (8)	2.3
8. Get more public service for my tax dollar	4.4	3.4 (12)	3.7 (12)	3.8
9. Improve and extend the telephone system	4.1	1.4 (21)	2.3 (15)	5.2
10. Increase or improve the physical facilities of the schools	4.1	2.3 (14)	4.4 (10)	4.7
11. Assess property taxes more fairly	3.7	5.2 (8)	3.2 (13)	5.6
12. Increase or improve the recreational facilities	3.7	3.3 (13)	4.0 (11)	3.1
13. Improve on the fairness of how laws are made and enforced	2.9	1.8 (18)	1.4 (20)	4.4
14. Strengthen the laws about protection of the environment	2.8	1.1 (23)	2.1 (16)	4.7
15. Know that public financial assistance is readily available	2.6	2.3 (15)	.7 (23)	6.3
16. Make the local leadership be more responsive to the voters	2.3	2.2 (17)	1.8 (17)	5.4
17. Have good safe water at my house	2.3	2.3 (16)	2.6 (14)	4.2

Appendix Table 6. Continued

Community needs	Index of importance by county residents[a]	Index of importance as leaders think others believe[a]	Index of importance as leaders personally believe[a]	The situation as scored by leaders[c]
18. Make bus service available throughout county	2.2	.3 (28)[b]	.3 (25)[b]	2.0
19. Have training so I can get a better job	1.9	1.8 (19)	.8 (22)	2.3
20. Have more training programs from the County Agent's Office	1.9	.3 (29)	1.1 (21)	5.6
21. Get more money from my job	1.9	4.5 (10)	1.8 (18)	3.3
22. Find a better way to get rid of garbage and sewage	1.8	3.8 (11)	7.5 (5)	2.8
23. Conserve the use of energy resources	1.8	1.5 (20)	4.9 (9)	3.3
24. Be able to get steady work	1.8	5.6 (5)	1.5 (19)	5.4
25. Improve TV reception	1.4	.6 (26)	.6 (24)	5.0
26. Improve the size or condition of my house	1.1	.7 (25)	0.0 (27)	4.8
27. Be located closer to my job	.8	.4 (27)	0.0 (28)	6.0
28. Increase welfare payments so I can take care of my family	.8	.9 (24)	0.0 (29)	6.5
29. Get on the welfare roll promptly without so much paper work	.7	1.3 (22)	.1 (26)	5.0

[a]The larger the number the more importance the group attaches to the item. The mean score is 3.4.

[b]Rank in parenthesis.

[c]The mean score is 5.0. A score of 5.0 for an item indicates that the leaders feel that the situation in the county is comparable to the situation in other counties with which they are familiar. A score greater than (less than) 5.0 indicates that this group feels that the situation in the counties is better than (worse than) the situation in other counties. The range is zero to ten.

Appendix Table 7. Commuting patterns of full-time employees in pilot county surveyed households, 1974

Location of job	No. of employees	Percent
Claiborne		
Tennessee Counties		
Claiborne	53	63.1
Campbell	2	2.4
Hamblen	2	2.4
Hancock	1	1.2
Knox	1	1.2
Kentucky Counties		
Bell	17	20.2
Butler	1	1.2
Knox	1	1.2
Unallocated Outside Claiborne[a]	2	2.4
Unknown location[a]	4	4.8
Clay		
Tennessee Counties		
Clay	53	61.6
Cumberland	1	1.2
Fentress	1	1.2
Macon	12	14.6
Overton	2	2.4
Smith	1	1.2
Sumner	1	1.2
Trousdale	1	1.2
Kentucky Counties		
Monroe	3	3.7
Warren	1	1.2
Kentucky (unknown county)	1	1.2
Unallocated Outside Clay[a]	2	2.4
Unknown location[a]	3	3.7
Hancock		
Tennessee Counties		
Hancock	55	68.8
Claiborne	1	1.2
Hamblen	17	21.2
Hamilton	1	1.2
Hawkins	2	2.5
Virginia (unknown county)	3	3.8
Unallocated Outside Hancock[a]	1	1.2
Unknown Location[a]	0	0.0
Overton		
Tennessee Counties		
Overton	54	61.4
Cumberland	1	1.1
Franklin	1	1.1
Putnam	25	28.4
White	1	1.1
Alabama (unknown county)	2	2.3
Kentucky (unknown county)	1	1.1
Unallocated Outside Overton	1	1.1
Unknown location[a]	1	1.1
Pickett		
Tennessee Counties		
Pickett	72	69.9
Fentress	1	1.0
Overton	6	5.8
Alabama (unknown county)	1	1.0
Kentucky County		
Clinton	3	2.9
Unallocated Outside Pickett[a]	12	11.6
Unknown location[a]	8	7.8

[a]In the survey, the location of employment was not reported for a small number of workers; these were classified as "unknown location." An additional small number of workers were reported to work outside their home counties but the specific location of employment was not provided; these were classified as "unallocated outside the given county."

Appendix Table 8. Distribution among industrial classifications of full-time employees in pilot county surveyed households, 1974

Industrial classification	CLAIBORNE COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	15.7	1.2	19.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0
Mining	7.2	6.0	8.9	8.9	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Construction	6.0	2.4	8.9	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Manufacturing	25.3	4.8	21.4	3.6	42.9	14.3	23.1	
Trucking, other transportation, and warehousing	2.4	1.2	3.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Communications, utilities, and sanitary service	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wholesale and retail trade								
Wholesale trade	2.4	1.2	3.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Food, bakery, and dairy stores	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Eating and drinking places	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7
Other retail trade	10.8	7.2	7.1	5.4	28.6	21.4	7.7	0.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services								
Business and repair service	3.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Private household	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other personal service	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
Entertainment and recreation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hospitals	6.0	4.8	3.6	3.6	7.1	7.1	15.4	7.7
Education and kindred services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other professional and related services	4.8	3.6	7.1	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public services	10.8	2.4	12.5	3.6	7.1	0.0	7.7	0.0

Appendix Table 8. Continued

Industrial classification	CLAY COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	18.3	3.7	31.2	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	9.8	2.4	14.6	2.1	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0
Manufacturing	37.8	23.2	20.8	12.5	62.5	33.3	60.0	50.0
Trucking, other transportation, and warehousing	1.2	1.2	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Communications, utilities and sanitary service	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wholesale and retail trade								
Wholesale trade	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Food, bakery, and dairy stores	6.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	12.5	0.0	10.0	0.0
Eating and drinking places	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other retail trade	4.9	1.2	8.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services								
Business and repair service	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other personal service	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Entertainment and recreation	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hospitals	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Education and kindred services	9.8	3.7	4.2	2.1	16.7	4.2	20.0	10.0
Other professional and related services	1.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public services	3.7	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 8. Continued

Industrial classification	HANCOCK COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	36.0	2.7	46.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6
Mining	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	13.3	5.3	13.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6
Manufacturing	20.0	12.0	13.2	11.3	53.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
Trucking, other transportation, and warehousing	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Communications, utilities, and sanitary service	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wholesale and retail trade								
Wholesale trade	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Food, bakery, and dairy stores	2.7	0.0	1.9	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eating and drinking places	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other retail trade	5.3	2.7	7.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services								
Business and repair service	2.7	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other personal service	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Entertainment and recreation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hospitals	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0
Education and kindred services	4.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	6.7	14.3	0.0
Other professional and related services	2.7	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public services	8.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 8. Continued

Industrial classification	OVERTON COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	8.0	2.3	14.6	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	9.2	6.9	14.6	10.4	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3
Manufacturing	35.6	8.0	29.2	8.3	50.0	5.0	50.0	16.7
Trucking, other transportation, and warehousing	3.4	1.1	6.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Communications, utilities, and sanitary service	3.4	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wholesale and retail trade								
Wholesale trade	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Food, bakery, and dairy store	4.6	2.3	4.2	2.1	5.0	0.0	8.3	8.3
Eating and drinking places	2.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other retail trade	8.0	6.9	6.2	6.2	10.0	5.0	16.7	16.7
Finance, insurance, and real estate								
Services								
Business and repair service	6.9	0.4	6.2	2.1	10.0	10.0	8.3	0.0
Private household	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other personal service	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Entertainment and recreation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hospitals	2.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0
Education and kindred services	8.0	1.1	6.2	0.0	10.0	10.5	5.3	0.0
Other professional and related services	4.6	1.1	6.2	0.0	0.0	5.3	5.3	0.0
Public services	1.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 8. Continued

Industrial classification	PICKETT COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	15.7	6.9	29.1	12.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	6.8	3.9	14.5	7.3	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Manufacturing	39.2	5.9	16.4	5.5	68.4	7.9	55.6	11.1
Trucking, other transportation, and warehousing	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
Communications, utilities, and sanitary service	2.9	2.0	5.5	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wholesale and retail trade								
Wholesale trade	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Food, bakery, and dairy stores	2.9	0.0	1.8	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eating and drinking places	2.9	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	22.2	0.0
Other retail trade								
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services	4.9	1.0	7.3	1.8	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Business and repair service	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other personal service	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Entertainment and recreation	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	2.6	0.0	0.0
Hospitals	2.0	2.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Education and kindred services	5.9	2.9	5.5	0.0	5.3	5.3	11.1	11.1
Other professional and related services	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.6	5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0
Public services	4.9	2.0	9.1	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 9. Distribution among job descriptions of full-time employees in pilot county surveyed households, 1974

	CLAIBORNE COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
Job type	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Professional, technical, and kindred worker								
Health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teacher – elementary and secondary schools	2.5	1.3	3.7	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Technicians, except health	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other professional worker	2.5	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Managers and administrators, except farm	12.7	2.5	14.8	1.8	16.7	8.3	0.0	0.0
Sales worker								
Wholesale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Retail	6.3	3.8	3.7	1.8	16.7	8.3	7.7	7.7
Clerical and kindred worker	7.6	2.5	5.6	1.8	16.7	8.3	0.0	0.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	1.3	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mechanics and repairmen	2.5	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Construction craftsmen	2.5	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Operatives								
Durable goods manufacturing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nondurable goods manufacturing	6.3	2.5	1.8	1.8	33.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
Nonmanufacturing industries	5.1	1.3	3.7	1.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0
Transportation equipment operator	6.5	5.1	9.3	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laborer, except farm	22.8	5.1	24.1	7.4	8.3	0.0	30.8	0.0
Farm worker								
Farmer and farm manager	11.4		14.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Farm labor and foremen	2.5	1.3	1.8	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
Service worker, except private household	2.5	2.5	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cleaning and food service	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Health service worker	3.8	2.5	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7
Personal service worker	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7
Protective service worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 9. Continued

Job type	CLAY COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Professional, technical, and kindred worker								
Health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teacher – elementary and secondary school	7.8	3.9	4.3	4.3	13.6	4.6	12.5	0.0
Technicians, except health								
Other professional worker	1.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Managers and administrators, except farm	13.0	0.0	19.2	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales worker								
Wholesale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Retail	2.6	1.3	2.1	0.0	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0
Clerical and kindred worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mechanics and repairmen	6.5	2.6	8.5	2.1	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
Construction craftsmen	9.1	2.6	12.8	2.1	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
Operatives								
Durable goods manufacturing	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	4.6	4.6	12.5	12.5
Nondurable goods manufacturing	23.4	15.6	6.4	4.3	54.6	31.8	37.5	37.5
Nonmanufacturing industries	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transportation equipment operator	3.9	2.6	6.4	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laborer, except farm	7.8	1.3	8.5	2.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm worker	13.0	1.3	21.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farmer and farm manager	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm labor and foremen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Service worker, except private household	3.9	0.0	2.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cleaning and food service	3.9	1.3	4.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
Health service worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal service worker	1.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Protective service worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 9. Continued

Job type	HANCOCK COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Professional, technical, and kindred worker								
Health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teacher – elementary and secondary schools	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	16.7	0.0
Technicians, except health	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other professional worker	4.0		5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Managers and administrators, except farm	4.0	1.3	3.6	1.8	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales worker								
Wholesale	1.3	1.3	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Retail	5.3	0.0	5.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clerical and kindred worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	2.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mechanics and repairmen	2.6	1.3	3.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction craftsmen	9.2	4.0	8.9	3.6	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7
Operatives	2.6	1.3	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7
Durable goods manufacturing	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7
Nondurable goods manufacturing	15.8	10.5	8.9	8.9	50.0	21.4	0.0	0.0
Nonmanufacturing industries	1.3	1.3	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transportation equipment operator	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laborer, except farm	4.0	1.3	3.6	1.8	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm worker	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0
Farmer and farm manager	30.3	0.0	41.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm labor and foremen	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
Service worker, except private household	2.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cleaning and food service	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Health service worker	1.3	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal service worker	2.6	0.0	1.8	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Protective service worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 9. Continued

OVERTON COUNTY

Job type	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Professional, technical, and kindred worker								
Health worker	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
Teacher – elementary and secondary schools	4.6	0.0	5.4	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Technicians, except health	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other professional worker	4.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Managers and administrators, except farm	5.8	0.0	7.1	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales worker	1.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wholesale	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Retail	2.3	2.3	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clerical and kindred worker	8.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	27.3	27.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers								
Mechanics and repairmen	5.8	3.4	8.9	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction craftsmen	6.9	5.8	10.7	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Operatives								
Durable goods manufacturing	6.9	3.4	7.1	5.4	5.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
Nondurable goods manufacturing	4.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nonmanufacturing industries	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transportation equipment operator	3.4	1.2	5.4	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laborer, except farm	25.3	9.2	16.1	7.1	45.0	20.0	36.4	0.0
Farm Worker								
Farmer and farm manager	4.6	1.2	7.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm labor and foremen	1.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Service worker, except private household	6.9	2.3	7.1	3.6	5.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
Cleaning and food service	2.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	9.1	9.1
Health service worker	1.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal service worker	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Protective service worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Appendix Table 9. Continued

Job type	PICKETT COUNTY							
	Percent of all full-time employees		Percent of heads of households		Percent of spouses		Percent of other household members	
	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county	Total	Employed out of resident county
Professional, technical, and kindred worker	4.3	1.1	7.6	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Health worker	2.2	2.2	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teacher -- elementary and secondary schools	1.1	1.1	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Technicians, except health	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other professional worker	1.1	1.1	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Managers and administrators, except farm	7.5	1.1	11.3	1.9	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales worker								
Wholesale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Retail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clerical and kindred worker	7.5	3.2	1.9	0.0	15.2	9.1	14.3	0.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	2.2	0.0	1.9	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mechanics and repairmen	2.2	1.1	3.8	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction craftsmen	6.4	3.2	11.3	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Operatives	6.4	1.1	1.9	0.0	12.1	3.0	14.3	0.0
Durable goods manufacturing	7.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nondurable goods manufacturing	20.4	3.2	11.3	3.8	30.3	3.0	42.9	0.0
Nonmanufacturing industries	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transportation equipment operator	2.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Laborer, except farm	7.5	2.2	5.7	3.8	12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm worker	1.1	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farmer and farm manager	12.9	5.4	22.6	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Farm labor and foremen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Service worker, except private household	3.2	1.1	3.8	1.9	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
Cleaning and food service	2.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	14.3	0.0
Health service worker	1.1	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal service worker	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Protective service worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private household worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37901

Agricultural Committee
Board of Trustees

Edward J. Boling, President of the University;
Clyde M. York, Chairman; Ben Douglass, Vice Chairman;
Wayne Fisher; Harry W. Laughlin; Don O. Shadow;
Edward S. Porter, Commissioner of Agriculture;
Webster Pendergrass, Vice President for Agriculture

STATION OFFICERS

Administration

Edward J. Boling, President
Webster Pendergrass, Vice President for Agriculture
E. J. Chapman, Assistant Vice President
J. A. Ewing, Dean
D. M. Gossett, Assistant Dean
T. J. Whatley, Assistant Dean
O. Clinton Shelby, Director of Business Affairs
G. W. F. Cavender, Director, Office of Communications

Department Heads

C. J. Southards, Agricultural Biology
J. A. Martin, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
D. H. Luttrell, Agricultural Engineering
R. R. Johnson, Animal Science
Judith L. Kuipers, Child and Family Studies
Mary R. Gram, Food Science, Nutrition, and Food Systems Administration
J. T. Miles, Food Technology and Science
J. W. Barrett, Forestry
D. B. Williams, Ornamental Horticulture and Landscape Design
L. F. Seatz, Plant and Soil Science
Anna J. Treece, Textiles and Clothing

Agricultural Research Units

Main Station, Knoxville, John Hodges III, Superintendent of Farms
University of Tennessee Comparative Animal Research Laboratory, Oak Ridge, H. E. Walburg, Laboratory Director
The University of Tennessee at Martin, Martin, Harold J. Smith, Dean, School of Agriculture.

Branch Stations

Dairy Experiment Station, Lewisburg, J. R. Owen, Superintendent
Highland Rim Experiment Station, Springfield, L. M. Safley, Superintendent
Middle Tennessee Experiment Station, Spring Hill, J. W. High, Jr., Superintendent
Plateau Experiment Station, Crossville, R. D. Freeland, Superintendent
Tobacco Experiment Station, Greeneville, Donald D. Howard, Superintendent
West Tennessee Experiment Station, Jackson, H. W. Luck, Superintendent

Field Stations

Ames Plantation, Grand Junction, James M. Bryan, Superintendent
Forestry Field Stations at Tullahoma, Wartburg, and Oak Ridge, Richard M. Evans, Superintendent
Milan Field Station, Milan, T. C. McCutchen, Superintendent

(1.8M/7-76)